

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of a telephonic interview on September 6, 2005 between Examiner Harold Kim and Attorney Jeffrey Klayman regarding the Office action dated June 29, 2005. During the telephonic interview, the Hitz reference was discussed in relation to the claimed invention. Hitz describes a mixed Unix/Windows file storage system in which Unix file security attributes are mapped to Windows file security attributes when a Windows client accesses a Unix file. In Hitz, if a Unix name cannot be mapped to a corresponding Windows name, then the Unix name is returned to the Windows client (Col. 6, lines 42-48). In the claimed invention, if the system is unable to map a Unix name to a Windows name, the system returns the Unix ID along with a Unix-specific indicator. The UNIX-specific indicator indicates a mapping problem. The inclusion of a UNIX-specific indicator is neither described nor suggested by Hitz.

2. The claims recite a method and apparatus for managing file security attributes including, among other things, mapping a Unix name to a Windows name, in response to a request from a client. In the claimed invention, if the Unix name cannot be mapped to a corresponding Windows name, the Unix ID and a Unix-specific indicator are returned. This Unix-specific indicator indicates to the client if there was a problem mapping the Unix name to a Windows name. As discussed during the telephonic interview on September 6, 2005 (summarized above), Hitz does not have the Unix-specific indicator required by the claims. Rather, if Hitz is unable to map the Unix name to a Windows name, Hitz merely returns the Unix name to the client. Therefore, in Hitz, the client is not notified that a mapping problem has occurred. Therefore, Applicant submits that, because Hitz does not teach the Unix specific indicator, the claimed invention is allowable over Hitz.

3. The claims have been amended to remove trademarks. References to “UNIX” have been replaced with references to a “first file security model,” while references to “Windows” have been replaced with references to a “second file security model.” These

amendments were not made to distinguish over prior art of record nor for any other reason relating substantively to patentability.

4. All pending claims are believed to be in a form suitable for allowance. Therefore, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Applicant Respectfully requests early allowance of the application. The Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned, Jeffrey T. Klayman, if it will assist further examination of this application.

5. The Applicants do not believe any extension of time is required for timely consideration of this response. In the event than an extension has been overlooked, this conditional petition of extension is hereby submitted, and Applicants request that deposit account number 19-4972 be charged for any fees that may required for the timely consideration of this application.

Date: September 29, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey T. Klayman  
Registration No. 39,250  
Attorney for Applicants

Bromberg & Sunstein LLP  
125 Summer Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1618  
Tel: (617) 443-9292  
Fax: (617) 443-0004

02337/00107 428829.1